



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/810,255   | 03/29/2004  | Alex Iosilevsky      |                     | 8302             |
| 7590   | 08/09/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Alex Iosilevsky<br>2159 - 31st Avenue<br>San Francisco, CA 94116 |             |                      | NGUYEN, KIM T       |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 3713                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/810,255             | IOSILEVSKY, ALEX    |  |
|                              | Examiner<br>Kim Nguyen | Art Unit<br>3713    |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/29/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The abstract exceeds 150 words in length. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 1, the claimed limitation “table a frame” should be corrected to “a table frame”.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines (US 2005/0032563) in view of Brown (US 2003/0064767) and Grauzer et al (US 2003/0064798).**

As per claim 1, Sines discloses an electronic game table comprising a table frame 300 (Fig. 3); a plurality of player terminals 306 (Fig. 3) including a display 308 (Fig. 3) and data input means 310 (Fig. 3); a central processing unit 304 (Fig. 3) connected to the player terminals. Sines does not disclose including a common display connected to the central processing unit and Sines does not explicitly disclose that the central processing include a random generator. However, Brown discloses a common display 15 (Fig. 2) and Grauzer discloses including a random generator in a processing unit (paragraph 0073). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the random generator with the processing unit of Sines as taught by Grauzer and to implement the common display of Brown to the game table of Sines in order to generate the game randomly and to allow all the players to monitor the progress of the game.

As per claim 2-3, Sines discloses connecting the central processing unit to the network Internet (lines 1-4 of paragraph 0075, and last 6 lines of paragraph 0077).

As per claim 4, Sines discloses including control means for anteing, betting or role of a dealer (paragraphs 0068-0069).

As per claim 5, Brown discloses positioning the common display on the table (Fig. 1).

As per claim 6-7, refer to discussion in claims 2-3 above.

As per claim 8, since Sines discloses a poker game table for a number of players up to six players or other tables with other player accommodation capacities (paragraph 0071) and since a poker game table can accommodate from two to ten players would have been both well known. Sines obviously encompasses teaching a game table for a number of players from two to ten players.

As per claim 9-14, refer to discussion in claims 9-14 above.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4441. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday during business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai, can be reached on 571-272-7147. The

central official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

kn

Date: August 3, 2005



Kim Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3713